DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 336 290 SO 021 212

AUTHOR Brosio, Richard A.
TITLE The Continuing Conflicting Imperatives in Schools and Society: The Right Is Wrong.
PUB DATE 90
NOTE 22p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Studies Association (November 2, 1990).
PUB TYPE Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Reports - Descriptive (141)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Capitalism; Current Events; *Democracy; Democratic Values; *Education Work Relationship; Elementary Secondary Education; Foreign Countries; Foreign Culture; *Futures (of Society); International Education; Political Issues; Political Science; Public Schools; United States History; World Affairs
IDENTIFIERS *Cold War

ABSTRACT

In spite of the claims of the conservatives, the principles underlying capitalism and democracy are not in concert with one another; they are, in fact, very much in conflict. The recent political changes in Eastern Europe need to be seen in greater complexity than simply the victory of the U.S. democratic-capitalist system over the communist system. The public school role in the United States can be understood most clearly if it is seen as occupying a contested site where the imperatives of democracy and capitalism, historically powerful and contradictory, clash. With a focus on recent decades, the history of U.S. public schooling is summarized. A 29-item list of references is included. (DB)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

RICHARD A. BROSIO

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

ED326296

The Continuing Conflicting Imperatives in Schools and Society: The Right is Wrong

Richard A. Brosio
Teachers College 806
Ball State University
Muncie, IN 47306
Office phone: (317) 285-5471
Home phone: (317) 747-1157

Individual Paper

1990 AESA Convention

SO 021 212

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

INTRODUCTION

During a historical period which features such profound changes in Central and Eastern Europe, it is necessary to evaluate carefully what is actually occurring - and what is not. Relatedly, it is of utmost importance for persons living in the United States, where the mainstream media has trumpeted the alleged oneness of capitalism and democracy, to evaluate especially carefully this old rightist claim. How will the momentous events which are occurring in the former Soviet Bloc affect those of us who have held that authentic democracy - and education for democratic empowerment - must necessarily struggle against the hegemony of capitalism?

It could be argued that all too many Americans have been interpreting the momentous occurrences in Central and Eastern Europe with a good deal of myopia, self-righteousness, and self-congratulation. All too many Western academicians and politicians saw the Soviet system as the very antithesis of what they believe to be a "universally valid model of liberal democracy and free-market capitalism with Judeo-Christian underpinnings."[1] As the events in the former Soviet Bloc unfold we see the analysis of Jeanne Kirkpatrick, et al. come undone; although there has occurred no mea culpa so far. Her rightist distinction between "their totalitarianism" and "our authoritarianism" has not been convincing to critical thinkers who do not already share her assumptions. Much of the right in this country has turned a blind eye to the persistence of savage human rights violations within our client states in Latin

America. Partisan wishes are being taken for historical realities, as we are told that there is no alternative to the ultimate triumph of political pluralism, liberalism, market capitalism, and Americanism. As Arno Mayer has written, "it takes an uncommon hubris to prescribe a frail Western European and North American formula, conditioned by particular historical circumstances, not only for Eastern Europe but also for much of the Third World . . . history is not about to end or travel down a unilinear . . . road. Instead, it will . . . follow a sinuous and contested path mined with the promises and perils of violent eruptions".[2]

Francis Fukuyama, who is the deputy director of the State Department's policy planning staff, wrote "The End of History," which was published in the neo-conservative The National Interest during the summer of 1989. Fukuyama begins by celebrating the triumph of "Western liberal democracy" but one can see early on that his definition of it is highly problematic, and certainly rightist-oriented. In fact, it sounds like "liberal democracy" is a stalking horse for capitalism. According to Fukuyama, the triumph of "liberal democracy" extends beyond "high politics and can be seen also in the ineluctable [inescapable, in a determinist sense] spread of consumerist Western culture in such diverse contexts as . . . clothing stores opened in Moscow, the Beethoven piped into Japanese department stores, and the rock music enjoyed . . . in Prague, Rangoon, and Tehran."[3] His essentialist position becomes clear when he writes that post-history will not feature art nor philosophy, but instead, only the continuous "caretaking of the museum of history".

E.P. Thompson claims that Fukuyama's position is absurd, as well as historically inaccurate. There have been, and are, many alternatives to centralized statism. Thompson suggests that there is a social democtatic alternative, an emerging "green" position, various models of workers' control, small-scale autonomous and cooperative units, and "many more". New forms of intelligent improvisation will be required for the twenty-first century, and these will surely be characterized by public and private components. In order to solve the very real problems of ecological disaster, growth at the expense of the poor, and insuring the continuation of human history we will have to employ the "fullest repertory of forms" - and this includes communities, neighborhoods, and families. Certainly, the "unrestrained market economy" is inadequate as a solution to the global problems facing civilized men and women. For Thompson, who sees socialism as an extension and broadening of participatory democracy, "the most viable future may well be a kind of socialism, although of a green and individualistic kind, with strong antistate resistances."[4] Gaven McCormack has said that only "the most adversarial logic" could reduce the problems of the East Bloc to the victory of capitalism. In fact, as we know, "free market" advocates have not always felt comfortable with, nor seen the necessity for, democracy - or even constitutional restraint. Chile under Pinochet comes readily to mind, as do the "Four Tigers" of East Asia: South Korea, Taiwan, Singapore, and Hong Kong. Noam Chomsky has pointed out that "as for democratic forms, at best they are limited under the constraints imposed by private command of resources and investment decisions . . ."[5]

McCormack makes another important criticism of Fukuyama, and other smug celebrators of victory in the Cold War, when he points out the extraordinary conceit inherent in the claim that "all that has really mattered to the world has been the struggle between the two military superpowers."[6] Chomsky, and others, have repeatedly asserted that the United States has intervened into the domestic affairs of nations which have tried to democratize their relationships while seeking to establish a modicum of equity, in terms of access, education, income, medical care, etc. - and that this intervention against popular forces has been advertised as anti-Soviet activity. According the Chomsky, the United States governments have manifested "extreme hostility to democracy unless power remains securely in the hands of business, oligarchy and military elements that respect U.S. priorities."[7]

In the studied opinions of many critical observers during the momentous occurrences in the former Soviet Bloc, it is highly naive, as well as irresponsible, to assume that "untrammeled marketization" will guarantee that future development of political freedom in Central and Eastern Europe. The experiences had by Latin Americans make clear that the intended generation, or exacerbation, of massive inequalities which are the inevitable results of "untrammeled marketization" tend to destabalize the foundations of political democracy. According to Geoffrey Eley, professor of history at the University of Michigan, if the rhetoric of "freedom" by the right continues to be used mostly as a club to beat upon discredited statism, then the promise of democracy in the East, and West, will remain unrealized. Will

Western aid for the former Soviet Bloc become a vehicle for the expansion of capital markets? Will the economic fate of Europe beyond the Elbe be mostly dependent upon Western capitalism's decision-making? Eley thinks that it is of crucial importance who exercises power in Western Europe. "The best chance for a strengthening of democratic decision making inside the EC [Common Market] during the 1990s, and therefore . . . a more equitable integration of the Eastern Countries, would be a strengthening of the left in the national governments."[8]

Daniel Singer has said that there are many reasons for the people in the former Soviet Bloc to look at us with envy - and they aren't all economic. However, those of us who live in the West know about the problems which are chronic and systemic within our societies.

> We know the spuriousness of that equality that makes it illegal for both the Baron de Rothschild and the clochard [vagrant] to sleep under the bridges of Paris. We know the sham of an electoral system that pretends that a Rupert Murdoch . . . has no more clout than Tom, Dick or Harry. We know that the Rockefellers stay in power even when they lose office . . . we are aware that handing over our sovereignty at regular intervals to representatives elected by the people - or rather imposed upon them by the power of money with the help of the media - is not the best way to gain mastery over our lives as producers and citizens."[9]

"Bourgeois democracy" was spoken of with contempt by persons on the left, not because they thought the freedoms which had been achieved were unimportant, but "because they wanted to expand the social content of those freedoms in order to give real meaning to such grand terms as liberty and equality . . ."[10] Flora Lewis has clarified what the events of 1989-90 in the former Soviet Bloc really mean. A system which has been stripped of its power to command may now develop in a manner yet to be decided upon - but

almost surely not in the way Fukuyama and other contemporary pro-capitalist Panglosses have suggested. There have occurred profound changes in the world near this bloody century's end; however, there has been no pure triumph for American-style capitalism - nor for Western-style liberalism. The next round of competition will include an analysis of the weaknesses and injustices of a society where monopoly capitalism has long frustrated the realization of democratic hopes. Lewis writes that we don't have enough laurels to rest on. "The scourge of drugs should suggest much more than inadequate law enforcement . . . . It has to mean that there is something . . . our society is failing to provide in its basic promise of community. We are producing . . . youths with inferior education . . . homeless who live on park benches and streets in the midst of empty buildings where they cannot afford space . . . We too have to deliver."[11]

Grzegorz Boguta, who is co-founder and director of Poland's premier underground publishing house, has explained that under the severe economic medicine proposed for Poland the very underground culture which helped topple his country's Soviet-backed, communist regime is itself in trouble. The draconian economic formula for Poland's hoped-for recovery has included components of Reaganism and Thatcherism. The standard of living for many Poles has plummeted. Poland seems to be opening itself to capitalist investment, while unruly workers are pressured to go along.[12] As Boguta has taught us, the price of paper has increased so dramatically that reading material is too costly to produce. "Books in Poland are on their way to becoming as expensive as books in the West, while our [the majority of Poles]

salaries aren't anywhere near those in the West."[13] Ironically, "we regained our democracy. But now what the censor forbade is forbidden by price."[14]

As it becomes increasingly possible for dialogue to occur among Europeans, and with persons around the world, we can continue to learn from each other. The problems involved in trying to build an authentically democratic society, and democratic educational system/process, will continue to be difficult. The specifics of those difficulties will be addressed most effectively by those who are involved in the struggles within their own sites and terrains.

The conceptual model which explains most clearly the theoretical work of those theorists who are convinced of the incompatibility of capitalism and democracy can be described as follows. It has been theorized that public schools in the United States are Janus-faced (having two contrasting aspects) because they are answerable to the imperatives of (1) capitalism, and (2) democracy, and/or egalitarianism. These contradictory imperatives create problems for public schools in other "developed" countries, as well, whose governmental forms are basically democratic, and whose social policies are committed to broad participation - while their economic systems are still dominated by capitalism. The capitalist economic imperative requests that the schools produce competent, willing workers; whereas, the democratic-egalitarian imperative requests that public education develop critical, well-rounded, citizen-workers who are committed to complex roles beyond work - and who may use their critical skills to analyze capitalist work relation, and command of the economy.

The public school's role can be understood most clearly if it is seen as occupying a contested site where two, historically powerful and contradictory, imperatives clash. This explanatory model enables us to understand schooling-education as answerable to the awesomely powerful economy, under capitalist aegis, but also influenced by popular demands made by working people, minorities, women, etc. This conflictive model enables us to study the institutional school within the framework of larger battles which have been occurring in many other sites, viz., the struggle between capitalist hegemony and its democratic-

egalitarian challengers. Seeing the school as a contested site, in the continuing battle between capital and democracy, allows us to connect with Gramsci, et al., who have argued that the formally constitutional State is itself a contested site.

Martin Carnoy and Henry Levin have sought to explain in their Schooling and Work in the Democratic State, (1985) how the public school can be (1) an institution which reproduces the hierarchical and unequal class relations characteristic of capitalism, and (2) an institution which is fairer, more democratic and equal than the workplace to which students are eventually bound. Capitalist hegemony works, but only imperfectly. The relationship between work and education is dialectical. According to Carnoy and Levin, "caught up in the larger conflicts inherent in a capitalist economy and liberal capitalist State . . . . The school is essential to the accumulation of capital and the reproduction of the dominant capitalist relations of production, and it is valued . . . as a means to greater participation in economic and political life."[15] The public school does respond to the requirements of unequal hierarchies which are inherent to capitalist work relations, so educators, must select and sort for highly unfair work slots; however, the school responds to democratic values and expectations associated with equality of access to citizen rights and opportunities. This battle occurs because, "the very nature of capitalism and democracy creates internal incompatibilities and conflicts in institutions."[16] It is well known that different historical periods have been characterized by comparative strengths and weaknesses with regard to the conflicting

imperatives; although it is the position of this writer that the strength of capitalism has been greater, in almost every case, than its democratic opponent. Because capitalism is unfair to the majority of persons' hopes for equity, security, and democratic voice (although it is riotously productive of useful, and not so useful, consumer goods) a class conflict models become useful to our analysis. Class, and other forms of conflict, are continuously occurring because those who are the losers in the capitalist economy, and attendant social, political, cultural, and educational institutions, have learned to use the freedoms afforded by the liberal constitutional State - which has become increasingly democratic in de jure terms - to redress grievances caused by the undemocratic, hierarchical nature of capitalism.

Even though the public school in the United States has responded historically to the democratic imperative, it is well known that from the beginning of secondary schooling, very different things happened to the students who were included under one, comprehensive roof. Michael Katz has argued that the basic structure of American education was set in circa 1880, and that it has not changed fundamentally since then. The fundamental characteristics of the system were, and are, "universal, tax-supported, free, compulsory, bureaucratic, racist, and class-biased."[17] It is clear that when working class kids were directed into vocational tracks and classes, they met with an anti-union bias. Furthermore, the newly developing "scientific" testing movement in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries was able to "objectively" classify the sons and daughters of the working class, immigrants, poor, and people of color as lacking

and unworthy. Colin Greer has said that the United States "has a public school system designed to preserve . . . [a] contradiction - by institutionalizing the rhetoric of change to preserve social stasis . . . . In fact, the public school stands as an instrument of the conservative strategy for defusing movements for social change which seriously challenge the established order . . . ."[18] When we use the Janus-faced model to explain various forms of answerability to the conflicting imperatives, we must remember that an authentically radical left has had little influence, let alone power, in the United States. Even when the official American left has been somewhat successful in its attempt to ameliorate the most brutal aspects of a market (Darwinian) distribution of goods, services, access, etc., the reaction from the right has been withering in its intensity. Katz has written, "I expect . . . that any serious effort to equip poor children as effective competitors for the well-to-do will meet enormous, and probably successful resistance."[19] The fierce, and momentarily successful, reaction mounted by capital, and its allies, during the time since Katz wrote those lines attests to the accuracy of his insight. The school's role as reproducer of capitalist relations of production and class stratification is tempered by occasional periods of effective popular democratic counterweight. Without this action, the capitalist imperative upon the schools is nearly preemptive.

As a result of real, and/or perceived, gains made by the left throughout American society during the 1960s (and since the New Deal), the forces of rightist reaction have mounted a counterattack in order to roll back and "chill" the democratic

imperative. The flurry of activities within the American educational community during the 1980s can be seen as an attempt by capital, and its followers, to get the public school back into sync with the newly developing requirements. As I have said elsewhere, because the current crisis of global monopoly capitalism has been primarily responsible for the present economic sea changes, the educational reforms proposed and enacted have corresponded to the economic crisis as defined by capital and "its conscious or seemingly unaware allies and minions." Had the present economic crisis been defined by other social classes, groups, and alliances - those using other discourses - then the pressure on the educational system would be different from what we have experienced.[20] Michael Apple has said, "There has been a remarkable offensive - one combining big business and finance, and conservative and religious groups - aimed at delegitimating democratic discourse and restoring 'authority' . . . . In education . . . what is also at stake are the conditions under which teachers will labor, the kinds of knowledge our children will learn, and ultimately whether we will have an educated citizenry that can raise the ethical and political questions so necessary to keep democracy a vital living force or instead a quiescent population more interested in personal gain than the social good."[21]

The rightist counterattack began as early as the Nixon administration. As we know, the first of several chilling recessions reintroduced many Americans to hard times in the 1970s. Furthermore, and relatedly, "In schooling, the Nixon program included a vast national plan called 'career eduction'.

Curriculum was tilted in the direction of work discipline and job training. Perhaps this would cool the ardor of youth. If not, careerism was followed in the mid-1970s by a 'Literacy Crisis' and a 'back-to-basics' movement. Perhaps those programs would put some noses to the grindstone."[22] We have come to understand that on educational sites conservative reaction intervenes against the possibilities of a more equitable, egalitarian, and democratic distribution of wealth, power, and access. The restoration has generally meant redistribution from the bottom and middle to the top. It is clear that rightist, restoration discourse has chosen words and dichotomies such as "quality versus equality"; furthermore, this reactionary movement poses as the defender of "high standards" and especially of "excellence". Many critics on the left believe that the words used in the reaction, whose purpose it is to restore and strengthen capitalist hegemony, are words which camouflage the real intention, which is to restore hierarchy, bossism, and domination by the powerful over subaltern groups. The reactionary discourse, which we have heard increasingly since 1970, poses as a universal one, instead of a self-conscious, and class-conscious attempt to roll back real, and alleged, gains made by popular and democratic groups.

Francis Fox Piven and Richard A. Cloward have provided us with an exceptionally clear analysis of what is at stake during the current rightist attempt to strengthen capitalist hegemony. Speaking of the Reagan administration's efforts to reverse policies which allowed ordinary citizens to force the State to protect them in the irrational and predatory marketplace, Piven

and Cloward point out accurately that capital and its allies have attempted to seize the ideological ground which enables them to claim that politics and the market, or economy, are separate. One could argue plausibly that neither the protest culture of the 1960s, nor the attempted rightist reaction since the first Nixon administration, have been successful at bringing stability to, or acceptance of, a system which is based upon contradictory imperatives, viz. capitalism and democracy. The popular forces, during the 1960s and since, have not been able to muster the power to make the economy answerable to democratic and egalitarian imperatives. As a result of the left's attempt, and failure, a powerful rightist coalition made up of the National Rifle Association, chief executive officers, religious zealots, frightened lower middle class persons concerned with loss of status, racists, sexists, militarists, elitist professors and intellectuals, etc. has arisen. This rightist coalition has been forced to operate within a system where it is difficult to act like fellow rightists in other countries where constitutional safeguards and democratic traditions are either weak or absent. The distinct possibility that the Reagan-Bush administration acted illegally in its arming of the "Contras" is beyond the scope of this analysis.

As Gramsci has taught us, the constitutional, democratic State must be answerable to its many constituents in order to preserve its legitimacy, but it is difficult to deny that in the last analysis it "tilts" toward favoring and representing capital, along with its myriad interests. It is true that superstructural institutions, like the schools, are able to

exercise some autonomy vis-a-vis the substructure. The pressures emanating from those who control, and most greatly benefit from, capital are mediated through complex institutions and actions before they have an impact upon the majority of persons - but these pressures affect us mightily day after day. In fact, as Henri Lebvre has said, capitalist hegemony has "colonized the everyday". Men, women, and kids do resist the blandishments and power of capitalism while in school, factories, offices, neighborhoods, etc.; however, they seldom resist on terrain, or under circumstances, which are favorable to democratic and egalitarian outcomes. More often than not, the resistance is unsuccessful. One is often haunted by the fear that popular gains have been won mainly because a rich, expansive capitalism could afford to give concessions, and that the so-called democratic imperative would be seriously weakened - as it has been since 1970, and especially during the 1980s - when capital felt the pinch and began to reveal the iron fist formerly concealed under the velvet glove.

In Democracy and Capitalism, (1986) Samuel Bowles and Herbert Gintis argue that democracy and capitalism represent profoundly different rules which regulate the development of persons and societies. Capitalism is characterized by the preeminence of economic privilege which is ultimately based upon property rights; whereas democracy champions the priorities of equity, liberty, and accountability which are based upon the exercise of personal rights.[23] The incompatibility of the two imperatives, or organizing principles, are described this way by Bowles and Gintis: "no capitalist society may reasonably be

called democratic in the . . . sense of securing personal liberty and rendering the exercise of power socially responsible.[24] One of the main theses of Democracy and Capitalism is that "democracy" has been used as window-dressing, or ornament, in capitalist societies. The "places" where things really get decided upon have not been democratic at all. "Representative government, civil liberties, and due process have, at best, curbed the more glaring excesses . . . of unaccountable power while often obscuring and strengthening underlying forms of privilege and dominations."[25] Within educational scholarship in this country, one has only to look at Clarence Karier's essay "Liberal Ideology and the Quest for Orderly Change",[26] or the position of many European, Western Marxists[27] to understand that more than a few on the left see liberalism, and liberals, as instinctively turning to the right whenever their interests - and the interests of property and capital - are threatened. Sounding very much like the authors of Schooling in Capitalist America, (1976) Bowles and Gintis tell us in 1986 that "democracy can only survive by expanding to cover areas of social life now dominated by the prerogatives of capitalist property."[28] Strengthening and expanding the preferred discourse of personal rights over property rights is dependent upon the ability of organized men and women, who must learn to take advantage of the legal reality of democratic forms and procedures, within a system which is both democratic and capitalistic. At the conclusions of both Schooling in Capitalist America and Democracy and Capitalism, the authors assert that it is up to organized historical actors to act upon their understanding of the realities and issues of our

time in order to tip the balance in favor of egalitarianism, and the enhancement of personal rights over property. In fact, authentic democracy depends upon it. Obviously, it has been the strategy of the right to prevent the popular forces from using their potentially greater electoral strength from being brought to bear on the political process, and especially the control of the central State.

In conclusion, while it is useful to speak of competing imperatives, it may be accurate to say that a balance between them is not really possible. This is because the power of capital is too great to be kept in equilibrium with democracy. Those who evaluate the powers of capital and democracy as greatly unequal must ultimately insist upon the victory of democracy in all facets of public life; obviously, this means the replacement of capitalism (although not of small entrepreneurs) by different forms of procedures, attitudes, modes of power, etc. Not only do attempts at serious democratization run smack into capitalist power here in the United States; but it could be argued reasonably that those who seek authentic democratization (not just vote-counting) in other countries will be opposed by the United States.

AFTERWORDS

George Counts told us in 1932 that, "Unless the democratic

tradition is able to organize and conduct a successful attack on the economic system, its complete destruction is inevitable. If democracy is to survive, it must seek new economic foundations."[29] The welcome demise of state socialism, and command economies in Central and Eastern Europe does not change fundamentally the need for authentic democratization in the United States, and around the world, if education for democratic empowerment can occur regularly within the public schools.

1. Arno J. Mayer, "Europe After the Great Thaw," The Nation 250, 14 (April 9, 1990): 488.

2. Ibid., 492.

3. Francis Fukuyama, "The End of History?" The National Interest 16 (Summer 1989): 3.

4. E.P. Thompson, "History Turns on A New Hinge," The Nation 250, 4 (January 29, 1990): 120.

5. Noam Chomsky, "The Dawn, So Far, Is in the East," The Nation 250, 4 (January 29, 1990): 133.

6. Gavan McCormack, "Capitalism Triumphant? The Evidence From 'Number One' (Japan)," Monthly Review 42, 1 (May 1990): 4.

7. Chomsky, "Dawn in the East," 133.

8. Ellen Morris, "Europe 1999: The Process and the Prospect," piece of the analysis by Geoffrey Eley, Michigan Today 22, 3 (June 1990): 6.

9. Daniel Singer, "New Days That Shake the World," The Nation 248, 17 (May 1, 1990): 594.

10. Ibid., 594.

11. Flora Lewis, "The Society Race," The New York Times Op-Ed section, August 6, 1989, 21.

12. Jon Wiener, "Capitalist Shock Therapy: The Plan in Poland," The Nation 250, 25 (June 25, 1990): 892.

13. "Talk of the Town," The New Yorker 66, 1 (February 19, 1990): 33.

14. Ibid., 34.

15. Martin Carnoy and Henry Levin, Schooling and Work in The Democratic State (Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 1985), 4.

16. Ibid., 4-5.

17. Michael B. Katz, Class, Bureaucracy, and Schools, Expanded Edition, (New York: Praeger Publishers, 1975), XVIII.

18. Colin Greer, The Great School Legend: A Revisionist Interpretation of American Public Education (New York: Basic Books, Inc., Publishers, 1972), 59.

19. Katz, Class, Bureaucracy, and Schools, 152.

20. Richard A. Brosio, "The Present Economic Sea Changes and the Corresponding Consequences for Education," Educational Foundations 3 (Fall 1987): 31.

21. Michael W. Apple, from Series editor's introduction, in Ira Shor, Culture Wars: School and Society in the Conservative Restoration 1969-1984 (Boston: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1986), X.

22. Shor, Culture Wars, 3-4.

23. Samuel Bowles and Herbert Gintis, Democracy and Capitalism (New York: Basic Books, Inc., Publishers, 1986), 3.

24. Ibid., 3.

25. Ibid., 4-5.

26. See: Clarence J. Karier, "Liberal Ideology and the Quest for Orderly Change," in Roots of Crisis: American Education in the Twentieth Century, eds. Clarence J. Karier, et al. (Chicago: Rand McNally & Company, 1973), 84-107.

27. See: Palmiro Togliatti, Lectures on Fascism (New York: International Publishers, 1976), An interview by Eric Hobsbawn with Giorgio Napolitano, The Italian Road to Socialism (Westport, CT: Lawrence Hill & Company, 1977), and the corpus of Antonio Gramsci's work.

28. Bowles and Gintis, Democracy and Capitalism, 211.

29. George S. Counts, Dare the School Build a New Social Order? (New York: The John Day Company, 1932), 45.